



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Society and much interested in the cause of international friendship and peace. He is the kind of man that will promote deeper friendly relations with China and the Chinese people. President Taft would not miss it if he named other members of the Peace Society to official posts in foreign countries. The foreign service ought to have none but peace men in it.

. . . The *Baptist Commonwealth* (Philadelphia), commenting on the growing armies and navies and military budgets of the time, exclaims: "Yet we are in the country founded on a recognition of the Christian religion, and in an era of the Prince of Peace. May God forgive us! With such enlightenment as the world has to-day, with such full knowledge of the economic waste in militarism and war, with such a recognition of the principles of righteousness, and with millions and millions of people praying daily that the kingdom of the Prince of Peace may come, there should be no need for armies and navies beyond the need of police protection."

. . . The rational observance of the Fourth of July at Cleveland, Ohio, without firecrackers and fireworks, was a great success. The people enjoyed a restful and sensible holiday. There were no accidents, whereas throughout the rest of the country there were forty-seven persons killed, twenty-four hundred injured, and over \$700,000 worth of property destroyed. Last year Cleveland had ten persons killed and sixty-two injured. Will the country be sane and brave enough to follow Cleveland's example?

. . . Hon. William L. Penfield, who died some weeks ago in Washington, was a strong and active friend of the cause of international arbitration and peace. While Solicitor of the State Department, a position which he held for a number of years, he contributed very materially to the work of our government in the field of arbitration. He was one of the men who represented the government before the Hague Court in the Pious Fund arbitration. His papers at the Mohonk Conference and at one or two peace congresses, though not of a popular nature, were very able and were always listened to with close attention and much appreciation.

. . . The luncheon given on June 22 in the House of Commons by the British Interparliamentary Group to the members of the Russian Duma and State Council, then visiting England, was an occasion of great interest. Lord Weardale, president of the Group, presided. All parties in the Russian Duma were represented in the visiting deputation, and their hosts represented both the great English parties. Both Mr. Asquith and Mr. Balfour, leader of the Opposition, were present and participated in the welcome, which was given to the guests not only as representatives of the Duma, but also of the Russian people. The president of the Duma, speaking for the visitors, expressed deep appreciation of the kindly hospitality extended to them, and his belief that the sympathy of England would greatly aid them in Russia in working out the welfare of their country through the new constitution.

. . . Lord Roberts' National Compulsory Service Bill, when it came to vote last month in the House of Lords, was defeated by a vote of 123 against it to 103 in its favor. The debate displayed the extreme weakness of the case for conscription.

. . . The Bath (England) Historical Pageant was this year given an interesting international character. In the final scene, representatives of the various Canadian and United States towns bearing the name of Bath presented to "Ladye Bath" a garland and a banner bearing the coat-of-arms of their respective States. The ladies from Canada and the United States were the guests of the Bath Pageant Committee during their stay at Bath. Eleven of our States were represented in the scene, and two of the Canadian Provinces. The dialogue given by these ladies was written by Mrs. Spencer Trask of New York, who is greatly interested in the cause of international friendship and peace. An ode specially written by her was sung at the close, one stanza of which ran thus:

"All folk upon the earth
Sprang from one common birth,
Children of God.
Lord of Humanity,
Teach us Fraternity;
Peace let the Watchword be
In all the earth."

. . . The Christian Camp Meeting at Craigville (Hyannis), Mass., this year gave one day to the peace movement. Addresses were given by Secretary Trueblood morning and afternoon, and in the evening by Rev. W. B. Flanders of Brockton.

. . . An association was founded in France on the 4th of July, under the name of *France-Amérique*, to "give more intensity to the cordial relations existing between the French democracy and the American democracy, to make America better known and better loved in France, to make France better known and better loved in America." Mr. Hanotaux, former Minister of Foreign Affairs, was chosen president.

. . . The proposition for the United States and Canada to hold a joint celebration to commemorate the one hundredth anniversary of the close of the war of 1812 and one hundred years of peace between the two countries is meeting with general approval. It is the proposition made originally by Secretary Root and remade by MacKenzie H. King, Canadian Minister of Labor, at the Harvard Commencement to erect somewhere along the Canadian boundary a suitable monument in celebration of this approaching centenary of peace—a peace "kept without the aid of warships and guns." We shall have more to say on this subject hereafter.

The Anglo-German Antagonism.

BY SENATOR D'ESTOURNELLES DE CONSTANT.

From Le Matin, Paris.

We are, of course, far from perfect happiness and universal peace, but nevertheless there has been progress. The practical value of international arbitration is no longer disputed. The incident of the fishermen of Hull and that of Casablanca have furnished two unanswerable lessons. What is called necessary war, inevitable war, is losing ground every day. Some twenty years ago we had only an embarrassment of choice among inevitable wars. To-day, even in the Balkan question, it is admitted that a bad arrangement is better than a conflagration. It is recognized that the United States and Japan would gain nothing by war. Russia has everything to lose in a war. The same is the case with Austria and Italy; much more so with the small powers.

There remains, in a word, but one war which is truly inevitable, according to the thought of certain persons. I mean an Anglo-German war. Let us consider, in the light of public opinion, what this unfortunate conviction is worth. The matter touches us Frenchmen very closely; for the question is asked whether we could remain merely spectators of the conflict, and whether England, if she engaged in it, would not necessarily draw France after her. According to this hypothesis, the *entente cordiale*, which we had supposed to be the commencement of a world *entente*, would have become only a military alliance, more or less disguised under the derision of pacific promises. Let us appeal to public opinion, for it is this which will solve the problem, provided it is not allowed to be taken unawares.

In reality, neither Germany nor England wishes war, and clearly nothing is more sincere than the declarations of the sovereigns of the governments and of the parliaments exchanged between the two countries in favor of peace. Germany would only compromise her future by war. That is perfectly clear. As for England, pessimism reasons otherwise, or fails to reason. It is certain that she is suffering profoundly from universal competition, and principally from the competition of Germany. Her maritime commerce is threatened in all parts of the world. She has not, like France, the resource of special and privileged productions to oppose to her rivals. German goods are being substituted in all the markets of the globe for English goods, as are American, Japanese, Swiss goods, etc. The English workman is down, is complaining. In the English colonies, at Shanghai as well as at London, the representative of English industry is displaced by the German representative, an intelligent, indefatigable pusher. So it is the future of the youth of the English nation which is growing darker. It is the era of an unexampled prosperity which is disappearing before an era of difficulties, and that too in a country full of the enjoyments of life; in a country where the need of prosperity has become national, hereditary, thanks to centuries of conquest and of success; in a country which, far from stopping in the pathway of its successes, aspires, on the contrary, to widen them by the extension of a new policy, that of imperialism, over the whole world. *Noblesse oblige*. How can one arrest the rush of life, — how stop it? It is English activity, English policy, English ambition suddenly checked when in full advance; and the difficulty will go on increasing. The population of Germany augments its vitality by means of its fleets. Will England, after having lost her economic superiority, allow herself to lose her naval superiority? Would it not be better to take advantage of her actual superiority and of her friendship with France to have done once for all with the German peril?

Such is the reasoning, not of the government certainly, but of the man in the street who directs those who govern. This reasoning I have heard developed since imperialism became a government doctrine. I heard it opposed to France in 1893, and just the same in 1898, and the man in the street naively believes that the German peril can be put an end to by means of a war. He believes it all the more the less he knows what war is. He has not suffered by war. Within the memory of man he has not known invasion. He does not pay, or scarcely pays, an income tax. And, finally, he is not

compelled to render military service. He has known no other wars, except remote expeditions made, to his profit, by hired troops. He is one of the only people in the world who live in this happy ignorance. There lies the danger. He has heard only of the German peril for years, and as he is brave, simple, a genuine bull, John Bull is ready to fall upon the only scarecrow which is shaken before him.

Nevertheless, it ought to be demonstrated to him that war, even a victorious one, far from being a remedy, would be the most detestable of operations, an aggravation, in a word. Let us suppose the German fleets and armies crushed. There would, nevertheless, remain in Germany sixty millions of German workingmen, all the more active the more they had suffered. And what would that mean? The remedy is understood by no one better than by the Englishman, who is virile, courageous and begins his life again without any complaint. The remedy is a new education in the presence of competition and no longer in the presence of assured success. The remedy is energy in labor and not a *coup d'état* of despair.

England is not a pessimist. She asks only to be allowed to direct her course in the way of her interests and the general interests of civilization. She will avoid war, as she desires to avoid ruin; and the rôle of France, her friend, will be to help her to find, as we have found ourselves, her "Damascus Road," for her own very great advantage and that of other peoples whom no government could stampede into an inevitable war, if France and England should unite with all the civilized states to safeguard peace.

The Cost of Armed Peace.

Address of Hon. J. A. Tawney at the National Peace Congress, Chicago, May 5, 1909.

The modern national state is a vastly different political organization from the ancient and mediæval empire. Part of this difference is of great significance in the discussion of international peace. As late as the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, when the modern state arose from the ruins of the old Roman Empire, it was commonly believed by the world's political leaders that there could be but one great nation at a given time, and that any nation to become great must conquer the wealth and enslave the people of other nations. From this conception of the relations of nations to each other it followed that no nation could hope to remain long dominant in world politics, and that every full bloom of national splendor and power must be followed by a period of decline and decay. Coalitions of foreign foes, want of patriotism, and the loss of individual manhood, which luxury and over-civilization always bring to a people supported by slaves, were ever present to threaten and destroy the dominant nation.

Even the Bourbon kings of France, as late as the reign of Louis the XIV., believed themselves to be, each in his time, the viceroys of God on earth. Not only did they believe themselves to be rulers by divine right, but they likewise believed it to be their duty as the viceroys of God to surpass all other kings in the splendor of their courts, to intimidate and subjugate abroad and at home, to imitate the glory of God in the splendor of their palaces, in the sumptuousness of their tables, and in the